arXiv:1412.7488v4 [math.PR] 13 Oct 2015

SPECTRAL GAP FOR RANDOM-TO-RANDOM SHUFFLING ON LINEAR EXTENSIONS

ARVIND AYYER, ANNE SCHILLING, AND NICOLAS M. THIÉRY

Abstract. In this paper, we propose a new Markov chain which generalizes random-to-random shuffling on permutations to random-to-random shuffling on linear extensions of a finite poset of size n. We conjecture that the second largest eigenvalue of the transition matrix is bounded above by $(1+1/n)(1-2/n)$ with equality when the poset is disconnected. This Markov chain provides a way to sample the linear extensions of the poset with a relaxation time bounded above by $n^2/(n+2)$ and a mixing time of $O(n^2 \log n)$. We conjecture that the mixing time is in fact $O(n \log n)$ as for the usual random-to-random shuffling.

1. Introduction

The random-to-random shuffle removes a card at a uniformly random position from a deck of n distinct cards and replaces it in the deck at another uniformly random position. This gives rise to a random walk on the permutations of the symmetric group S_n which has recently attracted a lot of attention. Random-to-random shuffling was originally described in [DSC95, Section 8.2] and its mixing time is proved to be $O(n \log n)$ (see Section 2). In his PhD thesis, Uyemura-Reyes [Rey02] refined this result by providing an upper bound of the order of $4n \log n$ and a lower bound of the order of $\frac{1}{2} n \log n$. Uyemura-Reyes also gave some partial results and many conjectures about the eigenvalues of the transition matrix. Since then, the constants have been further improved in [SCZ08, Sub13, MQ14]. One of the main motivations in the study of random-to-random shuffles is a conjecture of Diaconis [Dia03] on the existence of a cutoff at $\frac{3}{4} n \log n$. See [LPW09] for details about the mixing time and the cutoff phenomenon.

In this paper we propose a generalization of the random-to-random shuffling Markov chain by extending it to linear extensions of a finite poset P of size n. Denote the order of P by $\preceq$ and assume that the vertices of P are labeled by the integers in $[n] := \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. A *linear extension* of P is a permutation π in the symmetric group S_n such that

$\pi_i \prec \pi_j$ in P implies $i < j$ as integers. We denote by $\mathcal{L}(P)$ the set of all linear extensions of P.

Following [Sta09] we can now define analogues τ_i acting on $\mathcal{L}(P)$ of the simple transpositions $s_i = (i, i+1)$ acting on the right on S_n (that is, on positions). Namely, for $\pi \in \mathcal{L}(P)$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, set $\pi \cdot \tau_i := \pi s_i$ if π_i and π_{i+1} are incomparable in P, and $\pi \cdot \tau_i := \pi$ otherwise. That is, we interchange the two vertices at positions i and $i+1$ if πs_i is still a linear extension of P (see Figure 1 for examples). Note that, when P is the antichain (i.e. there are no relations between any elements of P), $\mathcal{L}(P) = S_n$ and $\tau_i = s_i$.

A natural analogue of picking a card at position i and inserting it at position j is then given by the operator $T_{i,j}$ defined as

$$T_{i,j} := \begin{cases} \tau_i \tau_{i+1} \cdots \tau_{j-1} & \text{if } i \leq j, \\ \tau_{i-1} \tau_{i-2} \cdots \tau_j & \text{if } i > j, \end{cases}$$

(see Figure 1 for examples). We define the *P-random-to-random shuffle* of $\pi \in \mathcal{L}(P)$ by picking two positions $i, j \in [n]$ uniformly at random and applying $T_{i,j}$. The transition matrix $M = M_P$ of the P-random-to-random shuffle Markov chain is then given by

$$M(\pi, \pi') = \frac{1}{n^2} \left| \{(i,j) \in [n] \times [n] \mid \pi' = \pi \cdot T_{i,j}\} \right| . \tag{1.1}$$

Again, if P is the antichain, this reduces to the usual random-to-random transition matrix (see for example [Rey02, Section 5]), in which case the entries are $1/n$ on the diagonal, $2/n^2$ if π and π' differ by a simple transposition, $1/n^2$ if they differ by any other transposition, and zero otherwise.

Note that the usual random-to-random transition matrix is $M = N^t N$, where N is the transition matrix for the random-to-top shuffle. Similarly for a general poset P, the above transition matrix $M_P = N_P^t N_P$ where N_P is the transition matrix of the promotion Markov chain [AKS14].

Our main conjecture is about the second-largest eigenvalue of the P-random-to-random shuffling transition matrix. A poset P is called *disconnected* if its Hasse diagram is a disconnected graph, that is, there exist two elements $x, y \in P$ such that there is no string of elements $x = x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k = y$ such that x_i and x_{i+1} are comparable in P for all $0 \leq i < k$. We call P trivial if it is the chain, since the chain has only one linear extension and there is no second-largest eigenvalue. For all other posets, we have the following conjecture.

Conjecture 1.1. *Let P be a finite nontrivial poset of size n and M_P be the transition matrix* (1.1) *of the P-random-to-random shuffling.*



FIGURE 1. Graph of the action of the operators τ_i (on the left) and of the operators $T_{i,j}$ for $i < j$ (on the right) on the linear extensions of the poset depicted in the middle. All loops are omitted (in particular, the operators $T_{i,i}$ do not appear). Using the fact that $T_{i,j} = T_{j,i}^{-1}$, the action of the operators $T_{i,j}$ for $i > j$ can be read off by reversing edges; for example, $3412 \cdot T_{4,1} = 1342$. The operators $T_{i,i+1} = \tau_i$ are highlighted the same way as in the left picture. The graph on the right illustrates the P-random-to-random shuffle Markov chain.

Then, the second-largest eigenvalue $\lambda_2(P)$ of M_P is bounded above by

$$\lambda_2(P) \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right)\left(1 - \frac{2}{n}\right) \tag{1.2}$$

with equality if and only if the poset P is disconnected. Furthermore, all eigenvalues are non-negative.

This statement includes the usual random-to-random Markov chain, when P is an antichain. For this special case, Uyemura-Reyes [Rey02] proved that $(1+1/n)(1-2/n)$ appears as an eigenvalue of the irreducible representation of S_n indexed by the partition $(n-1, 1)$ and therefore of M itself. A complete proof of all eigenvalues of the random-to-random Markov chain (which includes a proof that $(1+1/n)(1-2/n)$ is indeed the second largest eigenvalue) was recently given by Dieker and Saliola [DS15].

Usually precise formulas for the eigenvalues – or even just the second largest eigenvalue – of the transition matrix are hard to obtain. Since the largest eigenvalue of M_P is one, the second largest eigenvalue determines the spectral gap and the relaxation time. The mixing time

can be bounded in terms of the relaxation time and we show in Section 2 that the mixing time of the P-random-to-random Markov chain is $O(n^2 \log n)$. This gives a faster sampling of the linear extensions of finite posets than for the Markov chain of Bubley and Dyer [BD99] (though, as discussed in Section 2, the computational complexity is the same).

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we explain the implications of Conjecture 1.1 to the relaxation and mixing time. In Section 3 we provide computational evidence for the conjecture and prove it in special cases.

Acknowledgements. We would like to thank Franco Saliola and Mike Zabrocki for helpful discussions. Many thanks to Peter Gibson for suggesting the use of Wilkinson's theorem [Wil65, DD87] to prove the conjecture, and Vincent Delecroix for helpful comments on the manuscript.

The authors would like to thank the Indian Institute for Science in Bangalore for hospitality, where part of this work was done. AA would like to acknowledge support in part by a UGC Centre for Advanced Study grant. AS and NT were partially supported by the grant DSTO/PAM/GR/1171 from the National Mathematics Institute for their trip to Bangalore. AS was partially supported by NSF grant OCI–1147247 and the VI–MSS program sponsored by ICERM. NT was partially supported by NSF grant OCI–1147247 for his visit to UC Davis, where part of this work was performed.

2. Mixing time

In this section we explain the implications of Conjecture 1.1 for the mixing time of the P-random-to-random shuffling for a finite poset P.

2.1. Spectral gap to mixing time.

We begin by stating the main result of this section.

Theorem 2.1 (Bound on the mixing time)**.** *Let P be a finite nontrivial poset of size n. Assuming Conjecture 1.1, the mixing time of the P-random-to-random Markov chain is $O(n^2 \log n)$.*

Recall that the *total variation distance* between two distributions σ and τ on a set S is given by

$$\|\sigma - \tau\| = \max_{A \subset S} |\sigma(A) - \tau(A)| .$$

Let M be the transition matrix of an irreducible and aperiodic discrete Markov chain on a set S (in particular M is a row stochastic

matrix). For $x, y \in S$, the entry $M^k(x, y)$ denotes the probability of going from x to y in k steps of the Markov chain. The convergence of the Markov chain to its stationary distribution π is measured by

$$d(k) = \max_{x \in S} ||M^k(x, \cdot) - \pi(\cdot)|| .$$

By the Perron–Frobenius theorem, the convergence is exponential, that is, $d(k) \approx c\lambda^k$ for some constants c and $0 \leq \lambda < 1$.

The *mixing time* of a Markov chain is defined by choosing some $\varepsilon > 0$, and setting $t_{\text{mix}}(\varepsilon) := \inf\{t \geq 0 \mid d(t) \leq \varepsilon\}$.

Assume now that M is further reversible. Write $\lambda_2 = \lambda_2(M)$ for the second largest eigenvalue of M, and let $\gamma := 1 - \lambda_2$ be the *spectral gap* of M. Finally, let $t_{\text{rel}} := \frac{1}{\gamma}$ be the *relaxation time*. Then, by [LPW09, Theorem 12.4 and 12.3]

$$(t_{\text{rel}} - 1) \log\left(\frac{1}{2\varepsilon}\right) \leq t_{\text{mix}}(\varepsilon) \leq \log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon \pi_{\min}}\right) t_{\text{rel}} , \tag{2.1}$$

where $\pi_{\min}$ is the minimal value of the stationary distribution.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. By Conjecture 1.1 we have that $\gamma \geq \frac{1}{n} + \frac{2}{n^2}$ (with equality for disconnected posets). This implies that $t_{\text{rel}} \leq \frac{n^2}{n+2} \sim n$. In addition, $\pi_{\min} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}(P)|} \geq \frac{1}{n!} \sim (\frac{e}{n})^n$. Using these in (2.1) we obtain

$$\log\left(\frac{1}{\pi_{\min}}\right) = O(n \log n)$$

which implies $t_{\text{mix}}(\varepsilon) = O(n^2 \log n)$ as desired. □

For the random-to-random Markov chain (i.e. when P is the antichain) Diaconis and Saloff-Coste [DSC95] showed that the mixing time is $O(n \log n)$ as compared to $O(n^2 \log n)$ of Theorem 2.1. The proof connects the mixing time of the random-to-random shuffle to a transposition Markov chain, which was analyzed using the powerful machinery of S_n-representation theory, since the transposition $t_{i,j}$ in S_n can be written as a product of simple transpositions as

$$t_{i,j} = \begin{cases} s_i s_{i+1} \cdots s_{j-2} s_{j-1} s_{j-2} \cdots s_i & \text{if } i \leq j, \\ s_{i-1} s_{i-2} \cdots s_{j+1} s_j s_{j+1} \cdots s_{i-1} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

In our setting of a general poset P, we can replace each s_i by τ_i in (2.2). This yields an analogue of the transposition Markov chain for general P. However, the operators τ_i do not satisfy the braid relations $(s_i s_{i+1})^3 = 1$, which are replaced by the relation $(\tau_i \tau_{i+1})^6 = 1$ [Sta09]. Therefore, the representation theory of S_n is no longer at our disposal. Instead, we would need to study finite-dimensional representations of quotients

of the infinite Coxeter group defined by the above relations (which to our knowledge have not yet been studied in detail).

2.2. **Application to sampling of linear extensions.** Sampling the set of linear extensions of a poset is a fundamental problem in the theory of ordered sets and has important implications in computer science by virtue of its connections with sorting. Bubley and Dyer [BD99] define a Markov chain on the set of linear extensions which exhibits a mixing time of $O(n^3 \log n)$, which they prove using the method of path coupling. The mixing time of our chain of Theorem 2.1 is at most $O(n^2 \log n)$, which we believe can be even further improved to $O(n \log n)$ in analogy with the random-to-random chain as explained in the previous subsection.

Conjecture 2.2. *Let P be a finite nontrivial poset of size n. The mixing time of the P-random-to-random Markov chain is $O(n \log n)$.*

We have verified this conjecture on posets of small sizes by the following procedure. We fixed $\varepsilon = 0.1$. For sizes $n = 5, \ldots, 9$, we constructed 100 random posets in each case by adding order relations between pairs of elements with probability $1/n$ subject to consistency. Note that we need the probability to be small to avoid getting trivial posets. For each poset, we started with the identity element in the set of linear extensions, and calculated the mixing time. We averaged over the mixing time over 100 posets for each n, plotted this average as a function of n, and noted that the trend is consistent with $n \log n$. Further evidence is given in Section 3.6.

For a fair comparison, we now also compare the algorithmic complexity of the chain by Bubley and Dyer and our chain. With our notation, and acting on the right rather than on the left, each step of the Markov chain of Bubley and Dyer can equivalently be defined as follows: choose $c \in \{0, 1\}$ uniformly at random and an index $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n-1\}$ according to some specified probability distribution; if $c = 1$, apply τ_i on the current state π and otherwise leave π unchanged. The role of c is to make the chain aperiodic, but it does not much influence the order of magnitude of the mixing time or the algorithmic complexity.

Given that the operators $T_{i,j}$ in our P-random-to-random Markov chain are products of $O(n)$ of the operators τ_k, we see that the cost of each step of our chain is $O(n)$ times that of Bubley and Dyer's chain. Hence a mixing time of $O(n^2 \log n)$ would not be an improvement in terms of algorithmic complexity, but $O(n \log n)$ as stated in Conjecture 2.2 definitely would be.

It can further be noted that the probability of applying τ_k at some intermediate step of the uniform P-random-to-random chain matches with the probability distribution specified by Bubley and Dyer. Hence the two chains are very similar except that, in the P-random-to-random chain, the τ_k's are forced to be grouped in certain sequences.

3. Evidence

In this section, we provide various kinds of evidence for the validity of Conjecture 1.1. We report on systematic numerical checks in Section 3.1. We then prove the conjecture for two special families of posets in Sections 3.2 and 3.3. Our main result about the existence of the second-largest eigenvalue for disconnected posets is given in Section 3.4. We discuss further properties in Section 3.5 and conclude in Section 3.6 by showing that the diameter of the P-random-to-random Markov chain is small, and thus not an obstruction to Conjecture 2.2.

3.1. **Computational evidence.** Conjecture 1.1 has been checked numerically (with double precision) for all 2451 posets of size $n \leq 7$, and many posets of size 8 using `Sage` [S$^+$13, SCc08]. The second largest eigenvalue for all posets of size $n \leq 5$ is available in Figure 2.

3.2. **Proof for direct sums of chains.** In this section, we prove the conjecture for direct sums of chains, as a straightforward consequence of [Rey02] and [DS15] for the antichain. In particular, we use, as proven in [DS15], that for any n the random-to-random shuffling transition matrix on n vertices has second largest eigenvalue $(1 + 1/n)(1 - 2/n)$ and all eigenvalues are non-negative.

Proposition 3.1. *Conjecture 1.1 holds for any direct sum of chains.*

Proof. Let P be a finite poset with $|P| = n$. The operators τ_i satisfy the same relations as the elementary transpositions s_i except that, in general, the braid relation $(s_i s_{i+1})^3 = 1$ is replaced by $(\tau_i \tau_{i+1})^6 = 1$ [Sta09]. The usual braid relations hold if and only if the poset is a direct sum of chains [AKS14, Proposition 2.2]. Hence, in this case we can still use the representation theory of the symmetric group to study the Markov chain.

Let P be a direct sum of chains $C_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus C_\ell$. The representation of S_n given by the action of τ_i on $\mathcal{L}(P)$ is easily identified. Namely, not swapping two vertices that are in the same chain is equivalent to considering these two vertices as equivalent. In other words, we are considering a deck of n cards with repetitions, each chain C_i contributing $|C_i|$ identical cards.

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\mu = (|C_1|, \ldots, |C_\ell|)$ is weakly decreasing, and thus a partition of n, and that the vertices of the chains are numbered consecutively starting by labeling C_1 with the numbers $\{1, \ldots, |C_1|\}$, labeling C_2 with $\{|C_1|+1, \ldots, |C_1|+|C_2|\}$ etc.. With this notation, $\mathcal{L}(P)$ can be identified with the right quotient S_n/S_μ of the symmetric group by the parabolic subgroup S_μ, whose linear span is the induced representation $V_\mu := \mathrm{Ind}_{S_\mu}^{S_n} 1$. The usual random-to-random Markov chain (when P is the antichain) corresponds to the regular representation $V_{(1,\ldots,1)} = \mathbb{Q}S_n$.

If P is made of a single chain, we are done. Otherwise, basic representation theory states (see for example [Sag01, Chapter 2]) that the simple module indexed by the partition $(n-1,1)$ appears in V_μ. Therefore, by [Rey02, DS15], $(1+1/n)(1-2/n)$ is an eigenvalue of M on V_μ.

To conclude that $(1+1/n)(1-2/n)$ is indeed the second largest eigenvalue $\lambda_2(P)$ and that all eigenvalues are non-negative, we use that V_μ is a submodule of the regular representation $\mathbb{Q}S_n$ together with the assumption that the same statement holds there. □

Problem 1. *As discussed in Section 2.1, the P-random-to-random Markov chain always comes from a finite-dimensional representation V of a (finite quotient) of an infinite Coxeter group. Could this be used to describe the simple modules S_μ appearing in V and the eigenvalues of M on V_μ for general P?*

3.3. **Proof of Conjecture 1.1 for N-shaped posets.** We now prove the bound on the second largest eigenvalue for an infinite family of posets. Let P be a poset made of two chains, where the first chain is labeled $1, 2, \ldots, k$ from bottom to top and the second chain is labeled $k+1, k+2, \ldots, n$ from bottom to top. Build P_1 from P by adding an edge from the bottom $k+1$ of the second chain to the top k of the first chain. Similarly, let P_2 be obtained from P by adding an edge from the top k of the first chain to the bottom $k+1$ of the second chain. Note that P_2 is in fact a single chain labeled $1, 2, \ldots, n$ from bottom to top, whereas P_1 is an N-shape.

Note that the linear extensions of P are a disjoint union of those of P_1 and of P_2, namely $\mathcal{L}(P) = \mathcal{L}(P_1) \sqcup \mathcal{L}(P_2)$. Let M_P be the transition matrix for P, and build a block diagonal matrix $M_{P_1 \cup P_2}$ from the transition matrices M_{P_1} and M_{P_2} (a trivial block) in such a way that the rows and columns of M_P and $M_{P_1 \cup P_2}$ are labeled in the same order (with the identity linear extension of P_2 labeling the last row and column).

Example 3.2. Let $n = 4$ and $k = 2$. Then

$$P = \begin{array}{cc} 2 & 4 \\ \uparrow & \uparrow \\ 1 & 3 \end{array}, \qquad P_1 = \begin{array}{cc} 2 & 4 \\ \uparrow\nwarrow & \uparrow \\ 1 & 3 \end{array}, \qquad P_2 = \begin{array}{c} 4 \\ \uparrow \\ 3 \\ \uparrow \\ 2 \\ \uparrow \\ 1 \end{array}.$$

The linear extensions of P split into those of P_1 and of P_2 respectively: $\mathcal{L}(P_1) = \{3412, 3142, 3124, 1342, 1324\}$ and $\mathcal{L}(P_2) = \{1234\}$. With this labeling

$$M_P = \frac{1}{16}\begin{pmatrix} 8 & 4 & 2 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 4 & 4 & 3 & 3 & 2 & 0 \\ 2 & 3 & 6 & 0 & 3 & 2 \\ 2 & 3 & 0 & 6 & 3 & 2 \\ 0 & 2 & 3 & 3 & 4 & 4 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & 2 & 4 & 8 \end{pmatrix}, \quad M_{P_1\cup P_2} = \frac{1}{16}\left(\begin{array}{ccccc|c} 8 & 4 & 2 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 4 & 4 & 3 & 3 & 2 & 0 \\ 2 & 3 & 6 & 1 & 4 & 0 \\ 2 & 3 & 1 & 6 & 4 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 4 & 4 & 6 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 16 \end{array}\right).$$

Theorem 3.3. *Let P_1 be the N-shape poset as above. Then*

$$\lambda_2(P_1) \le \left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right)\left(1 - \frac{2}{n}\right).$$

Note that the eigenvalues of $M_{P_1\cup P_2}$ are the same as the eigenvalues of M_{P_1} with an additional one. Our strategy for the proof of Theorem 3.3 is to relate the eigenvalues of $M_{P_1\cup P_2}$ to those of M_P using Wilkinson's theorem. Denote the eigenvalues of a symmetric matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ by

$$\lambda_1(M) \ge \lambda_2(M) \ge \cdots \ge \lambda_n(M).$$

Theorem 3.4 (Wilkinson [Wil65, DD87])**.** *Suppose $B = A + \tau cc^T$, where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ is symmetric, $c \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times 1}$ has unit norm, and $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$. If $\tau \ge 0$, then*

$$\lambda_i(B) \in [\lambda_i(A),\, \lambda_{i-1}(A)] \qquad (2 \le i \le n),$$

whereas if $\tau \le 0$

$$\lambda_i(B) \in [\lambda_{i+1}(A),\, \lambda_i(A)] \qquad (1 \le i \le n-1).$$

Proof of Theorem 3.3. Let N_P and $N_{P_1\cup P_2}$ be the random-to-top transition matrices for the posets P and $P_1 \cup P_2$, respectively. They only differ in the way linear extensions of the form

$$\pi^{(1,i)} = 1, 2, \ldots, i-1,\ k+1,\ i, \ldots, k,\ k+2, \ldots, n \quad (\text{for } 1 \le i \le k)$$

together with the identity transition to either

$$\pi^{(0)} = 1, \ldots, k-1,\ k+1, \ldots, n,\ k$$

or the identity. More concretely, the matrix $E = N_{P_1 \cup P_2} - N_P$ has entries $1/n$ in row $\pi^{(0)}$ and columns $\pi^{(1,i)}$, entries $-1/n$ in the identity (last) row and columns $\pi^{(1,i)}$, entry $-k/n$ in row $\pi^{(0)}$ and the identity (last) column, and entry k/n in the identity row and column.

Now consider

$$M_{P_1 \cup P_2} = N_{P_1 \cup P_2}^t N_{P_1 \cup P_2} = (N_P + E)^t (N_P + E) \\ = M_P + E^t N_P + N_P^t E + E^t E \,.$$

Since E and N_P are known explicitly, it is straightforward to compute $E^t N_P + N_P^t E + E^t E$. Namely, define the linear extensions

$$\pi^{(2,i)} = 1, \ldots, k-1,\ k+1, \ldots, i,\ k,\ i+1, \ldots, n, \quad (\text{for } k+1 \le i \le n).$$

Then $E^t N_P + N_P^t E + E^t E$ contains entries $1/n^2$ (resp. $-(n-k)/n^2$) in rows $\pi^{(1,i)}$ and columns $\pi^{(2,j)}$ (resp. identity), entries $1/n^2$ (resp. $-k/n^2$) in rows $\pi^{(2,i)}$ and columns $\pi^{(1,j)}$ (resp. identity), and entries $-(n-k)/n^2$ (resp. $-k/n^2$ or $2k(n-k)/n^2$) in the identity row and columns $\pi^{(1,i)}$ (resp. $\pi^{(2,i)}$ or identity). When $\pi^{(1,i)}$ and $\pi^{(2,j)}$ are equal (namely for $i = k$ and $j = k+1$), the just stated entries are added together.

The matrix $E^t N_P + N_P^t E + E^t E$ can further be written as the sum of two rank one matrices. Namely

$$M_{P_1 \cup P_2} = M_P + \tau c c^t - \tau d d^t \,,$$

where $\tau = 1/2k(n-k)n^2$, $c \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 1}$ has entry $n-k$ (resp. k or $-2k(n-k)$) in rows $\pi^{(1,i)}$ (resp. $\pi^{(2,j)}$ or identity), and $d \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 1}$ has entry $n-k$ (resp. $-k$) in rows $\pi^{(1,i)}$ (resp. $\pi^{(2,j)}$). Again, entries are added when $\pi^{(1,i)}$ and $\pi^{(2,j)}$ are equal.

We are now going to apply Wilkinson's Theorem 3.4 twice with $A = M_P$, $B_1 = M_P - \tau d d^t$, and $B_2 = M_{P_1 \cup P_2} = B_1 + \tau c c^t$. Since $\tau > 0$, we obtain

$$\lambda_i(B_1) \in [\lambda_{i+1}(A), \lambda_i(A)] \,, \\ \lambda_i(B_2) \in [\lambda_i(B_1), \lambda_{i-1}(B_1)] \,,$$

so that in particular $\lambda_3(B_2) \le \lambda_2(B_1) \le \lambda_2(A)$. Recall that by Proposition 3.1, $\lambda_2(A) = \lambda_2(P) \le (1+1/n)(1-2/n)$. The matrix $B_2 = M_{P_1 \cup P_2}$ is block diagonal; the block corresponding to P_2 consists of a 1 and contributes an eigenvalue 1. This implies that $\lambda_2(P_1) = \lambda_3(P_1 \cup P_2) = \lambda_3(B_2)$. Combining these inequalities yields $\lambda_2(P_1) \le (1+1/n)(1-2/n)$ as desired. □

In principle a similar approach can be applied for other posets besides the N-shape posets, by removing one cover relation $a \prec b$ from a

poset P_1 to obtain poset P and by defining P_2 by adding the relation $b \prec a$ instead. The linear extensions of P are again a disjoint union of the linear extensions of P_1 and P_2, so that one can compare the block diagonal matrix for P_1 and P_2 with the matrix for P. Computer experimentation indicates that the two matrices still differ by sums of rank 1 matrices. However, the number thereof increases and, in general, it is harder to control bounds for λ_2 by repeated use of Wilkinson's theorem.

Problem 2. *Can one generalize the idea of the proof for N-shaped posets, possibly using Wilkinson's theorem, to prove Conjecture 1.1?*

3.4. **Existence of $(1+1/n)(1-2/n)$ as eigenvalue.** Next we show that Proposition 3.1 implies that $(1+1/n)(1-2/n)$ is an eigenvalue for any disconnected poset. To this end, let P be a finite poset and Q a direct sum of chains obtained by linearly ordering each connected component of P (this is not unique, but we just pick one such linear ordering). Define the map

$$\mathrm{sort}\colon \mathcal{L}(P) \to \mathcal{L}(Q)$$

which takes a linear extension $\pi \in \mathcal{L}(P)$ and returns the linear extension of Q obtained by sorting the elements within each connected component according to the corresponding chain.

We will now show that the sort map is a *contraction* or *lumping* [LPW09] from the Markov chain on $\mathcal{L}(P)$ to the Markov chain on $\mathcal{L}(Q)$. In our context, this means the following. Suppose $\Pi, \Sigma \in \mathcal{L}(Q)$. For every $\sigma, \sigma' \in \mathcal{L}(P)$ such that $\mathrm{sort}(\sigma) = \mathrm{sort}(\sigma') = \Sigma$, there exist $\pi, \pi' \in \mathcal{L}(P)$ (possibly equal) such that $\mathrm{sort}(\pi) = \mathrm{sort}(\pi') = \Pi$ and $M(\sigma, \pi) = M(\sigma', \pi')$. We then define the *lumped* Markov chain on $\mathcal{L}(Q)$ by setting $M(\Sigma, \Pi) = M(\sigma, \pi)$. Equivalently, the "sort" action always commutes with the "Markov chain" action.

Proposition 3.5. *The map* sort *commutes with the operators τ_i, that is,* $\mathrm{sort} \circ \tau_i = \tau_i \circ \mathrm{sort}$. *This implies that M_Q is a lumping (quotient) of M_P. In particular, any eigenvalue for M_Q lifts to an eigenvalue of M_P.*

Proof. For $\pi \in \mathcal{L}(P)$, consider $\pi \cdot \tau_i$. If π_i and π_{i+1} belong to the same connected component of P, then τ_i acts trivially on $\mathrm{sort}(\pi)$. But in this case $\mathrm{sort}(\pi \cdot \tau_i) = \mathrm{sort}(\pi)$, so that indeed $\mathrm{sort}(\pi \cdot \tau_i) = \mathrm{sort}(\pi) \cdot \tau_i$. Otherwise π_i and π_{i+1} belong to different connected components and τ_i exchanges π_i and π_{i+1}. Linearly ordering the vertices of P commutes with interchanging the labels of two nodes in different components. This proves the claim. □

Corollary 3.6. *Let P be a disconnected poset with $|P| = n$. Then $(1+1/n)(1-2/n)$ is an eigenvalue of M_P.*

Proof. It is well-known that the set of eigenvalues of the contracted or lumped Markov chain is contained in the set of eigenvalues of the original chain. See, for example, [CLR10, Section 1.1]. The claim then follows by Proposition 3.1. □

3.5. **Further properties.** We now discuss properties that are suggested by the data in Figure 2. Recall that the *dual* $\overline{P}$ of a poset P is defined as the poset on the same elements such that $x \preceq y$ in $\overline{P}$ if and only if $y \preceq x$ in P. One first observes that the second largest eigenvalue for a poset and its dual coincide. In fact, the Markov chains are isomorphic.

Proposition 3.7. *Let P be a poset and $\overline{P}$ its dual. Then reversing linear extensions yields an isomorphism between the P- and $\overline{P}$-random-to-random shuffle Markov chain.*

Proof. Remark first that reversal of linear extensions conjugates τ_i on $\mathcal{L}(P)$ to τ_{n-i} on $\mathcal{L}(\overline{P})$: for π a linear extension of P and $\overline{\pi}$ the linear extension of $\overline{P}$ obtained by reversing π, one has $\overline{\pi \cdot \tau_i} = \overline{\pi} \cdot \tau_{n-i}$; indeed τ_i swaps the values a and b at positions i and $i+1$ in π if and only if a and b are incomparable in P if and only if a and b are incomparable in $\overline{P}$ if and only if τ_{n-i} swaps the values a and b at positions $n-i+1$ and $n-i$ in $\overline{\pi}$. Therefore, by composition, the reversal of linear extensions conjugates the transition matrix $M_{i,j}$ on $\mathcal{L}(P)$ to $M_{n-i+1,n-j+1}$ on $\mathcal{L}(\overline{P})$. The statement follows. □

The data in Figure 2 also suggests that the second largest eigenvalue decreases when adding comparability edges. Namely, in Figure 2 the posets are partially ordered with respect to inclusion of comparisons: $P \subseteq Q$ if for some labelling of the vertices of P and Q, $a \prec b$ in P implies $a \prec b$ in Q for all a, b. Almost everywhere λ_2 is order-reversing: $P \subseteq Q$ implies that $\lambda_2(P) \geq \lambda_2(Q)$. The smallest counterexample occurs for $n = 5$ and is unique up to duality. Namely take P the second leftmost poset in the fourth row, and Q the leftmost poset in the third row.

Problem 3. *Although the order-reversal property does not hold in general, one could hope that it holds under certain additional conditions. Could one use this refined property, together with the fact that disconnected posets are at the bottom of the inclusion poset, to prove Conjecture 1.1? For N-shaped posets, this is exactly the approach we took in the proof of Theorem 3.3.*

(A) $n = 1, 2, 3$



FIGURE 2. The second largest eigenvalue for all posets of size $1 \leq n \leq 5$, preceded each time by the number of linear extensions. For each n, the posets are ordered by inclusion of comparison relations. For comparison, for $n = 2, 3, 4, 5$, the conjectured bound $(1+\frac{1}{n})(1-\frac{2}{n})$ on the second largest eigenvalue is given by 0.0, $0.44\overline{4}$, 0.625, 0.72, respectively.

3.6. **On the diameter of the Markov chain.** A necessary condition for a small mixing time is that the states of the system are not too far away from each other; namely $t_{\text{mix}}(\varepsilon) \geq L/2$, where L is the *diameter* of the graph of the Markov chain, that is the largest graph distance between any two states (see e.g. [LPW09], Equation (7.3)). We now show that the diameter of the P-random-to-random Markov chain is small enough, despite its size, to not be an obstruction to Conjecture 2.2.

Proposition 3.8. *Let P be a poset of size n. Then the diameter of the P-random-to-random shuffle Markov chain is bounded above by n.*

Proof. Take two linear extensions π and π'. Without loss of generality, we may assume that P is labeled by $1, \ldots, n$ according to the second linear extension π'. Let us try to sort π to π' using the operators $T_{i,j}$.

Assume that the first $i-1$ positions are sorted, that is, π starts with $1, 2, \ldots, i-1$. We want to move i, which is at some position $j \geq i$ in π to the i-th position. Given that π' is a linear extension and starts

(B) $n = 4$


1, None
2, 0.0
2, 0.25
2, 0.25
3, 0.466506350946
3, 0.466506350946
4, 0.25
6, 0.466506350946
4, 0.625
6, 0.466506350946
5, 0.5
8, 0.625
8, 0.625
6, 0.625
12, 0.625
24, 0.625

(c) $n = 5$



with $1, \ldots, i$, the values at positions $i, \ldots, j-1$ are incomparable to i. Therefore applying the operator $T_{j,i}$ moves i at position j to position i, as desired.

Applying induction on i shows that π' is reachable from π by the application of at most n operators. □

References

[AKS14] Arvind Ayyer, Steven Klee, and Anne Schilling. Combinatorial Markov chains on linear extensions. *J. Algebraic Combin.*, 39(4):853–881, 2014.

[BD99] Russ Bubley and Martin Dyer. Faster random generation of linear extensions. *Discrete Math.*, 201(1-3):81–88, 1999.

[CLR10] Pietro Caputo, Thomas M. Liggett, and Thomas Richthammer. Proof of Aldous' spectral gap conjecture. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 23(3):831–851, 2010.

[DD87] Jerome Dancis and Chandler Davis. An interlacing theorem for eigenvalues of selfadjoint operators. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 88/89:117–122, 1987.

[Dia03] Persi Diaconis. Mathematical developments from the analysis of riffle shuffling. In *Groups, combinatorics & geometry (Durham, 2001)*, pages 73–97. World Sci. Publ., River Edge, NJ, 2003.

[DS15] A. B. Dieker and Franco Saliola. Spectral analysis of random-to-random Markov chains. *preprint arXiv:1509.08580*, 2015.

[DSC95] P. Diaconis and L. Saloff-Coste. Random walks on finite groups: a survey of analytic techniques. In *Probability measures on groups and related structures, XI (Oberwolfach, 1994)*, pages 44–75. World Sci. Publ., River Edge, NJ, 1995.

[LPW09] David A. Levin, Yuval Peres, and Elizabeth L. Wilmer. *Markov chains and mixing times*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2009. With a chapter by James G. Propp and David B. Wilson.

[MQ14] Ben Morris and Chuan Qin. Improved bounds for the mixing time of the random-to-random insertion shuffle. *preprint arXiv:1412.0070*, 2014.

[Rey02] Jay-Calvin Uyemura Reyes. *Random walk, semi-direct products, and card shuffling*. ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 2002. Thesis (Ph.D.)–Stanford University.

[S+13] W. A. Stein et al. *Sage Mathematics Software (Version 5.9)*. The Sage Development Team, 2013. `http://www.sagemath.org`.

[Sag01] Bruce E. Sagan. *The symmetric group*, volume 203 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 2001. Representations, combinatorial algorithms, and symmetric functions.

[SCc08] The Sage-Combinat community. Sage-Combinat: enhancing Sage as a toolbox for computer exploration in algebraic combinatorics, 2008. `http://combinat.sagemath.org`.

[SCZ08] L. Saloff-Coste and J. Zúñiga. Refined estimates for some basic random walks on the symmetric and alternating groups. *ALEA Lat. Am. J. Probab. Math. Stat.*, 4:359–392, 2008.

[Sta09] Richard P. Stanley. Promotion and evacuation. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 16(2, Special volume in honor of Anders Bjorner):Research Paper 9, 24, 2009.

[Sub13] Eliran Subag. A lower bound for the mixing time of the random-to-random insertions shuffle. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 18:no. 20, 20, 2013.

[Wil65] J. H. Wilkinson. *The algebraic eigenvalue problem*. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1965.

Department of Mathematics, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore - 560012, India.
E-mail address: arvind@math.iisc.ernet.in

Department of Mathematics, UC Davis, One Shields Ave., Davis, CA 95616-8633, U.S.A.
E-mail address: anne@math.ucdavis.edu

Univ Paris-Sud, Laboratoire de Recherche en Informatique, Orsay, F-91405; CNRS, Orsay, F-91405, France
E-mail address: Nicolas.Thiery@u-psud.fr